IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 6068 of 1991

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE D.H.WAGHELA Sd/-

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

1 to 5 No

RAMESHBHAI PUJABHAI VAGHELA

Versus

GUJARAT AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 6068 of 1991

MR DS VASAVADA for Petitioner No. 1

MR SN MAZGAONKAR for Respondents No. 1-2

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE D.H.WAGHELA

Date of decision: 19/02/2002

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. The learned counsel Mr.S.N.Mazgaonkar appearing for the respondents submitted that the workmen concerned in the petition and their grievances are dealt with by

the respondents in accordance with the scheme approved in the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the judgment reported in AIR 2001 SC 706. The main petitioner Shri Rameshbhai Pujabhai Vaghela is regularized in his service even earlier to the aforesaid order. A statement is also made that the workmen concerned in the petition are similarly treated with equanimity and in accordance with the scheme as aforesaid and, even after that if any of the workmen concerned have any grievance as regards applicability or implementation of the scheme, or otherwise, it is open for them to approach appropriate forum under the Industrial Law. However, the present petition has become infructuous, according to the submission. The learned counsel Mr.Vasavada conceded to the position that the service of the first petitioner is already regularized and relying on the statement made by the learned counsel, the other workmen concerned also have been granted suitable benefits to which they might be entitled under the scheme. Therefore, in short, the petition does not survive and is required to be disposed as having become infructuous. Accordingly, the petition is disposed as having become infructuous. Rule is discharged with no order as to costs. Interim relief stands vacated.

Sd/-

19.2.2002 (D.H.Waghela,J.)

(KMG Thilake)